



## State of Connecticut

### HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

STATE CAPITOL  
HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT 06106-1591

**REPRESENTATIVE VINCENT J. CANDELORA**  
EIGHTY-SIXTH DISTRICT

405 SEA HILL ROAD  
NORTH BRANFORD, CONNECTICUT 06471

HOME: (203) 481-4463  
CAPITOL: (860) 240-8700  
TOLL FREE: (1800) 842-1423  
FAX: (860) 240-0207  
E-MAIL: Vincent.Candelora@housegop.ct.gov

**RANKING MEMBER**  
FINANCE, REVENUE AND BONDING COMMITTEE

**MEMBER**  
PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE  
PROGRAM REVIEW AND INVESTIGATIONS COMMITTEE  
REGULATIONS REVIEW COMMITTEE

Testimony of  
State Representative Vincent J. Candelora  
Senate Bill 63,  
An Act Mandating Employers Provide Paid Sick Leave To Employees  
Before the Labor Committee

February 25, 2010

Chairwoman Edith Prague, Chairman Kevin Ryan, Ranking Member Anthony Guglielmo, Ranking Member Selim Noujaim, and other distinguished Members of the Labor Committee, thank you for the opportunity to provide testimony on **SB 63, An Act Mandating Employers Provide Paid Sick Leave To Employees.**

The bill before you mandates that businesses employing 50 or more persons to provide paid sick leave to their employees. If this bill were to pass, Connecticut would be the first state to mandate this requirement and it certainly would exacerbate our reputation - as one of the most unfriendly states to do business and promote job growth. It has failed in a number of states, including California, Ohio, New Jersey, and Washington. Mandatory paid sick leave is just another burden on the businesses in this state.

This legislation has been brought before the General Assembly in years past and it has failed for good reason. SB 63 asserts that this would apply to only large businesses - but most large businesses are already providing paid sick leave. This is a mandate on business exactly at a time when they are besieged with burdensome regulations. Even more devastating would be the effect this bill would have on job creation by smaller businesses. As startup companies grow and hire more employees, and passes the 50 employees mandate in this legislation, they would then have to account for the sick leave in their budgets and determine how to pay for it. This is a disincentive to grow and hire Connecticut residents exactly at a time when we have lost 94,000 jobs during this recession. Recent history shows that we have not created an atmosphere that will cultivate the growth of small business. I am afraid that this bill will worsen job growth at a time when we are dead last in job growth since 1989 among all states and are the 5<sup>th</sup> highest state in the nation in cost of doing business, according to the Milken Institute and The Connecticut Business and Industry Association.

This paid sick leave bill sterilizes the employee/employer relationship and removes any flexibility in the workplace. Employers spend more time with their employees than their own families in some circumstances. In my business, many of my part time employees are teenagers. When they are sick or wish to attend an event or party, they have the flexibility to trade hours with another employee or cover shifts. I recently had an employee who injured himself outside of work. He lost a considerable amount of time as a result. As his employer, I had the flexibility to pay him for his missed time above and beyond his negotiated benefits package. This paid sick leave bill reduces this supportive, nurturing relationship to yet another inflexible, bureaucratic state mandate.

By limiting the applicability to a certain number of employees, the legislature recognizes that this bill is not good for small business. If the bill is not good for small business, then it certainly is not for big business either. Connecticut is faced with large companies leaving our state due to our cost of doing business. Most recently, the Attorney General has resorted to suing Pratt & Whitney in an attempt to keep jobs here. Imposing more mandates that seek to micromanage an employee's relationship with their employer and suing companies to stay in Connecticut is hardly a good job creation plan for the State of Connecticut.

For the reasons I have stated above, I respectfully request that this committee reject SB 63. Once again, thank you for your time and consideration in regards to SB 63. If you have any further questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Respectfully Yours,

Vincent Candelora  
State Representative